



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/672,216	09/28/2000	Shigeru Yoshida	MAT-8023US	8354

7590

01/15/2003

Lawrence E Ashery
Ratner and Prestia
One Westlakes, Berwyn Suite 301
P. O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482-0980

EXAMINER

LE, DANG D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2834

DATE MAILED: 01/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/672,216

Applicant(s)

YOSHIDA ET AL.

Examiner

Dang D Le

Art Unit

2834

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 November 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5-13 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 14 and 15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

1. The request filed on 11/26/02 for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 based on parent Application No. 09/672,216 is acceptable and an RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - Claim 1, lines 3 and 8, insert – motor – before “base”. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 5,256,922) in view of Cox et al. (U. S. Pat. No. 5,705,868).

Regarding claim 1, Tanaka et al. show a surface mountable motor base comprising:

- A motor base (101, Figure 9);
- A bearing supporter (102) extending from said base for supporting a bearing (110);
- A stator supporter (outer circumferential surface of 102) concentric with said bearing supporter for supporting a stator (105); and
- A terminal (140) for connection to a winding (106) of said stator, said terminal exposed on a bottom of said motor base and extending substantially parallel (left to right, Figure 9) to said base.

Tanaka et al. do not show a plurality of terminals.

Cox et al. show a plurality of terminals (72) for the purpose of making a three-phase motor.

Since Tanaka et al. and Cox et al. are all from the same field of endeavor; the purpose disclosed by one inventor would have been recognized in the pertinent art of the others.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to include a plurality of terminals as taught by Cox et al. for the purpose discussed above.

Regarding claim 14, it is noted that Tanaka et al. also show said surface mountable motor base being one of a plurality of surface mountable motor bases included in a frame (of an optical disk).

Regarding claim 15, it is noted that Tanaka et al. also show said terminal (142) being flat.

6. Claims 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. in view of Cox et al. as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hiroyasu (JP09070162).

Regarding claim 2, the motor of Tanaka et al. modified by Cox et al. includes all of the limitations of the claimed invention except for a plurality of said motor bases being linked to each other.

Hiroyasu shows a plurality of the motor bases being linked to each other (Figure 1) for the purpose of increasing the production of the motors.

Since Tanaka et al., Cox et al. and Hiroyasu are all from the same field of endeavor; the purpose disclosed by one inventor would have been recognized in the pertinent art of the others.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to link a plurality of said motor bases to each other as taught by Hiroyasu for the purpose discussed above.

Regarding claim 3, it is noted that Hiroyasu also shows a plurality of said motor bases being linked to each other and forming a belt-like shape.

Regarding claim 4, it is noted that Hiroyasu also shows a plurality of said motor bases being linked to the frame (2) in width direction of the belt-like shape, and adjacent said motor bases being separated in longitudinal direction.

Information on How to Contact USPTO

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dang D Le whose telephone number is (703) 305-0156. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nestor Ramirez can be reached on (703) 308-1371. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9318 for regular communications and (703) 872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1782.

DDL
January 10, 2003

DL

Dang D. Le